arXiv:1606.06453v1 [math.PR] 21 Jun 2016

Nash estimates and upper bounds for non-homogeneous Kolmogorov equations

Alberto Lanconelli* Andrea Pascucci†

This version: June 22, 2016

Abstract

We prove a Gaussian upper bound for the fundamental solutions of a class of ultra-parabolic equations in divergence form. The bound is independent on the smoothness of the coefficients and generalizes some classical results by Nash, Aronson and Davies. The class considered has relevant applications in the theory of stochastic processes, in physics and in mathematical finance.

Keywords: Nash estimates, Kolmogorov equations, ultra-parabolic equations, fundamental solution, linear stochastic equations

1 Introduction

We consider the Kolmogorov-type equation with measurable coefficients

$$Lu := \sum_{i,j=1}^{m_0} \partial_{x_i}(a_{ij}\partial_{x_j}u) + \sum_{i=1}^{m_0} \partial_{x_i}(a_i u) + cu + \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} b_{ij}x_j\partial_{x_i}u + \partial_t u = 0, \qquad (t,x) \in \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d. \tag{1.1}$$

where $m_0 \leq d$ and L verifies the following two standing assumptions:

Assumption 1.1. *The coefficients $a_{ij} = a_{ji}, a_i, c$, for $1 \leq i,j \leq m_0$, are bounded, measurable functions such that*

$$\mu^{-1}|\xi|^2 \leq \sum_{i,j=1}^{m_0} a_{ij}(t,x)\xi_i\xi_j \leq \mu|\xi|^2, \qquad \xi \in \mathbb{R}^{m_0},\ (t,x) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}, \tag{1.2}$$

for some positive constant μ.

Assumption 1.2. *The matrix $B := (b_{ij})_{1\leq i,j\leq d}$ has constant real entries and takes the block-form*

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} * & * & \cdots & * & * \\ B_1 & * & \cdots & * & * \\ 0 & B_2 & \cdots & * & * \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & B_\nu & * \end{pmatrix} \tag{1.3}$$

where each B_i is a $(m_i \times m_{i-1})$-matrix of rank m_i with

$$m_0 \geq m_1 \geq \cdots \geq m_\nu \geq 1, \qquad \sum_{i=0}^{\nu} m_i = d,$$

and the blocks denoted by "$*$" are arbitrary.

*Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Bari Aldo Moro, Bari, Italy. **e-mail**: alberto.lanconelli@uniba.it
†Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Bologna, Bologna, Italy. **e-mail**: andrea.pascucci@unibo.it

Degenerate equations of the form (1.1) naturally arise in the theory of stochastic processes, in physics and in mathematical finance. For instance, if W denotes a real Brownian motion, then the simplest non-trivial Kolmogorov operator

$$\frac{1}{2}\partial_{vv} + v\partial_x + \partial_t, \qquad t \geq 0,\ (v,x) \in \mathbb{R}^2,$$

is the infinitesimal generator of the classical Langevin's stochastic equation

$$\begin{cases} dV_t = dW_t, \\ dX_t = V_t dt, \end{cases}$$

that describes the position X and velocity V of a particle in the phase space (cf. [21]). Notice that in this case we have $1 = m_0 < d = 2$.

Linear Fokker-Planck equations (cf. [11] and [33]), non-linear Boltzmann-Landau equations (cf. [22] and [7]) and non-linear equations for Lagrangian stochastic models commonly used in the simulation of turbulent flows (cf. [6]) can be written in the form

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \partial_{v_i}(a_{ij}\partial_{v_j} f) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} v_j \partial_{x_j} f + \partial_t f = 0, \qquad t \geq 0,\ v \in \mathbb{R}^n,\ x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \tag{1.4}$$

with the coefficients $a_{ij} = a_{ij}(t,v,x,f)$ that may depend on the solution f through some integral expressions. Clearly (1.4) is a particular case of (1.1) with $n = m_0 < d = 2n$ and

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ I_n & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

where I_n denotes the $(n \times n)$-identity matrix.

In mathematical finance, equations of the form (1.1) appear in various models for the pricing of path-dependent derivatives such as Asian options (cf., for instance, [27], [5]), stochastic volatility models (cf. [16], [30]) and in the theory of stochastic utility (cf. [1], [2]). In interest rate modeling, equations of the type (1.1) were used in the study of the possible realization of Heath-Jarrow-Morton models in terms of a finite dimensional Markov diffusion (cf. [34], [8]).

A systematic study of Kolmogorov operators has been carried out by several authors. In the case of constant coefficients, Kupcov [19], Lanconelli and Polidoro [20] studied the geometrical properties of the operator, giving necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of the fundamental solution. In the case of *Hölder continuous coefficients* and assuming invariance properties with respect to a suitable homogeneous Lie group, existence of a fundamental solution has been proved by Weber [36], Il'in [17], Eidelman [14] and Polidoro [31]; pointwise upper and lower bounds for the fundamental solution, mean value formulas and Harnack inequalities are given in [31] and [32]. Schauder type estimates have been proved by Satyro [35], Lunardi [23], Manfredini [24]. In the more general case of non-homogeneous Kolmogorov equations with Hölder continuous coefficients, the existence of a fundamental solution has been proved by Morbidelli [25] and Di Francesco and Pascucci [12]; Harnack inequalities and Schauder estimates were proved by Di Francesco and Polidoro [13]. The first results for Kolmogorov operators with *measurable coefficients* were proved by Cinti, Pascucci and Polidoro in [28], [9].

The main result of this paper is a Gaussian upper bound, independent of the smoothness of the coefficients, for the transition density/fundamental solution $\Gamma = \Gamma(t,x;T,y)$ of (1.1). Before stating our result, we introduce the following

Notation 1.3. *Let $M > 0$ and $B := (b_{ij})_{1\le i,j\le d}$ a matrix that satisfies Assumption 1.2. We denote by $\mathcal{K}_{M,B}$ the class of Kolmogorov operators L of the form* (1.1)*, that satisfy Assumption 1.1 with the non-degeneracy constant μ in* (1.2) *and the norms $\|a_i\|_\infty$, $\|c\|_\infty$ smaller than M.*

The following theorem generalizes the classical results by Nash [26],[15], Aronson [3] and Davies [10] for uniformly parabolic equations and provides step forward for the study of non-linear Kolmogorov equations.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $L \in \mathcal{K}_{M,B}$ and $T_0 > 0$. There exists a positive constant C, only dependent on M, B and T_0, such that*

$$\Gamma(t,x;T,y) \le \frac{C}{(T-t)^{\frac{Q}{2}}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{C}\left|\mathcal{D}\left((T-t)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right)\left(x - e^{-(T-t)B}y\right)\right|^2\right), \tag{1.5}$$

for $0 < T-t \le T_0$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, with

$$\mathcal{D}(r) := \operatorname{diag}(rI_{m_0}, r^3 I_{m_1}, \dots, r^{2\nu+1} I_{m_\nu}), \qquad r > 0, \tag{1.6}$$

where I_{m_i} denotes the $(m_i \times m_i)$-identity matrix, and

$$Q := m_0 + 3m_1 + \cdots + (2\nu+1)m_\nu. \tag{1.7}$$

The exponent $\frac{Q}{2}$ appearing in estimate (1.5) is optimal, as it can be easily seen in the case of constant-coefficient Kolmogorov operators whose fundamental solution is explicit (see (1.10)). Notice the difference with respect to the uniformly parabolic case: for instance in $\mathbb{R}^3$, for the heat operator $\partial_{xx} + \partial_{yy} + \partial_t$ we have $Q = 2$, while for the prototype Kolmogorov operator $\partial_{xx} + x\partial_y + \partial_t$ we have $Q = 4$. To explain the specific form of the Gaussian exponent in (1.5) and the role of the constant Q in (1.7) (that is typically greater than the Euclidean dimension d), we recall some basic facts about Kolmogorov operators and the Lie group structures on $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ naturally associated with them.

Let us first rewrite (1.1) in the compact form

$$Lu = \operatorname{div}(ADu) + \operatorname{div}(au) + cu + Yu = 0,$$

where $D = (\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_d})$ denotes the gradient in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $A := (a_{ij})_{1\le i,j\le d}$, $a := (a_i)_{1\le i\le d}$ with $a_{ij} = a_i \equiv 0$ for $i > m_0$ or $j > m_0$, and

$$Y := \langle Bx, D\rangle + \partial_t, \qquad (t,x) \in \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d.$$

The *constant-coefficient Kolmogorov operator*

$$L_0 := \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{m_0} \partial_{x_i x_i} + Y$$

will be referred to as the *principal part of L*. It is known that Assumption 1.2 is equivalent to the hypoellipticity of L_0: in fact, Assumption 1.2 is also equivalent to the well-known Hörmander's condition, which in our setting reads:

$$\operatorname{rank}\operatorname{Lie}\left(\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_{m_0}}, Y\right)(t,x) = d+1, \qquad \text{for all } (t,x) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1},$$

where $\operatorname{Lie}\left(\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_{m_0}}, Y\right)$ denotes the Lie algebra generated by the vector fields $\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_{m_0}}$ and Y (see Proposition 2.1 in [20]). Thus operator L can be regarded as a perturbation of its principal part

L_0: roughly speaking, Assumption 1.1 ensures that the sub-elliptic structure of L_0 is preserved under perturbation.

Constant-coefficient Kolmogorov operators are naturally associated to *linear* stochastic differential equations: indeed, L_0 is the infinitesimal generator of the d-dimensional SDE

$$dX_t = BX_t dt + \sigma dW_t, \tag{1.8}$$

where W is a standard m_0-dimensional Brownian motion and σ is the $(d \times m_0)$-matrix

$$\sigma = \begin{pmatrix} I_{m_0} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{1.9}$$

The solution X of (1.8) is a Gaussian process with transition density

$$\Gamma_0(t,x;T,y) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^d \det \mathcal{C}(T-t)}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\langle \mathcal{C}(T-t)^{-1}\left(y - e^{(T-t)B}x\right), \left(y - e^{(T-t)B}x\right)\rangle\right) \tag{1.10}$$

for $t < T$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where

$$\mathcal{C}(t) = \int_0^t \left(e^{sB}\sigma\right)\left(e^{sB}\sigma\right)^* ds$$

is the covariance matrix of X_t. Assumption 1.2 ensures (actually, is equivalent to the fact) that $\mathcal{C}(t)$ is positive definite for any positive t. Moreover, Γ_0 in (1.10) is the fundamental solution of L_0 and the function

$$u(t,x) := E\left[\varphi\left(X_T\right) \mid X_t = x\right] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma_0(t,x;T,y)\varphi(y)dy, \qquad t < T,\ x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

solves the backward Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases} L_0 u(t,x) = 0, & t < T,\ x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \\ u(T,x) = \varphi(x) & x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \end{cases}$$

for any bounded and continuous function φ.

Operator L_0 has some remarkable invariance properties that were first studied in [20]. Denote by $\ell_{(\tau,\xi)}$, for $(\tau,\xi) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, the left-translations in $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ defined as

$$\ell_{(\tau,\xi)}(t,x) := (\tau,\xi) \circ (t,x) := \left(t + \tau, x + e^{tB}\xi\right),$$

Then, L_0 is invariant with respect to ℓ_ζ in the sense that

$$L_0\left(u \circ \ell_\zeta\right) = (L_0 u) \circ \ell_\zeta, \qquad \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}.$$

Moreover, let $\mathcal{D}(r)$ be as in (1.6): then L_0 is homogeneous with respect to the dilations in $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ defined as

$$\delta_r(t,x) := \left(r^2 t, \mathcal{D}(r)x\right), \qquad r > 0,$$

if and only if all the $*$-blocks of B in (1.3) are null ([20], Proposition 2.2): in that case, we have

$$L_0(u \circ \delta_r) = r^2 (L_0 u) \circ \delta_r, \qquad r > 0.$$

Since the Jacobian $J\mathcal{D}(r)$ equals r^Q, the natural number Q in (1.7) is usually called the *homogeneous dimension* of $\mathbb{R}^d$ with respect to $(\mathcal{D}(r))_{r>0}$.

Now let us consider the case of a Kolmogorov operator $L \in \mathcal{K}_{M,B}$ with variable coefficients. It turns out that the invariance properties of the principal part L_0 are inherited by L in terms of "invariance within the class $\mathcal{K}_{M,B}$". More explicitly, for the left-translations we have

Remark 1.5. *Let $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ and $L \in \mathcal{K}_{M,B}$. If u is a solution of $Lu = 0$ then $v := u \circ \ell_\zeta$ solves $L^{(\zeta)}v = 0$ where $L^{(\zeta)}$ is obtained from L by left-translating its coefficients, that is $L^{(\zeta)} = L \circ \ell_\zeta$. Moreover, operator $L^{(\zeta)}$ still belongs to $\mathcal{K}_{M,B}$.*

As for dilations, we have to distinguish between *homogeneous Kolmogorov operators* (i.e. operators with null $*$-blocks in (1.3)) and general Kolmogorov operators.

Remark 1.6. *Let $\lambda > 0$ and $L \in \mathcal{K}_{M,B}$ be a homogeneous Kolmogorov operators. If u is a solution of $Lu = 0$ then $v := u \circ \delta_\lambda$ solves $L^\lambda v = 0$ where L^λ is obtained from L by dilating its coefficients, that is $L^\lambda = L \circ \delta_\lambda$. Moreover, operator L^λ still belongs to $\mathcal{K}_{M,B}$.*

By virtue of the previous remarks, it turns out that the crucial step to achieve estimate (1.5) is to prove it for $t = 0$, $T = 1$ and $y = 0$, that is

$$\Gamma(0, x; 1, 0) \leq C \exp\left(-\frac{|x|^2}{C}\right), \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{1.11}$$

with C *dependent only on M and B*. Indeed, once (1.11) is proved, then the general estimate for $L \in \mathcal{K}_{M,B}$ follows from the invariance of the class $\mathcal{K}_{M,B}$ with respect to the left-translations ℓ and the intrinsic dilations δ. It is then clear that the factor $(T-t)^{-\frac{Q}{2}}$ and the term $\left(x - e^{-(T-t)B}y\right)$ in the exponential of (1.12) come directly from the use of translations and dilations in the intrinsic Lie group structure.

Estimate (1.5) is consistent with the following Gaussian upper bound for Kolmogorov operators with *Hölder continuous coefficients*, proved in [31] and [12] (see also [18], [4]) by means of the classical parametrix method:

$$\Gamma(t, x; T, y) \leq C\Gamma_0(t, x; T, y), \qquad t < T,\, x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{1.12}$$

with $C = C(M)$ and Γ_0 as in (1.10) with $\sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2M} I_{m_0} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Notice that for *homogeneous* Kolmogorov operators, the constant C in estimate (1.5) is independent of $T - t$.

In the case of *non-homogeneous* Kolmogorov operators, which is the main focus of this paper, the lack of homogeneity makes the proof of (1.11) rather involved. The invariance property of Remark 1.5 remains unchanged, while the scaling argument cannot be used anymore. However, we have the following result (see Remark 3.2 in [20]).

Lemma 1.7. *Let $\lambda > 0$ and $L \in \mathcal{K}_{M,B}$. If u is a solution of $Lu = 0$ then $v := u \circ \delta_\lambda$ solves $L^\lambda v = 0$ where*

$$L^\lambda u := \operatorname{div}(A^{(\lambda)} Du) + \langle B^{(\lambda)} x, Du \rangle + \partial_t u + \operatorname{div}(a^{(\lambda)} u) + c^{(\lambda)} u(t, x), \tag{1.13}$$

with

$$A^{(\lambda)}(t, x) = A\left(\delta_\lambda(t, x)\right), \qquad a^{(\lambda)}(t, x) = \lambda a\left(\delta_\lambda(t, x)\right), \qquad c^{(\lambda)}(t, x) = \lambda^2 c\left(\delta_\lambda(t, x)\right),$$

and $B^{(\lambda)} = \lambda^2 \mathcal{D}_\lambda B \mathcal{D}_{\frac{1}{\lambda}}$, *that is*

$$B^{(\lambda)} = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^2 B_{1,1} & \lambda^4 B_{1,2} & \cdots & \lambda^{2\nu} B_{1,\nu} & \lambda^{2\nu+2} B_{1,\nu+1} \\ B_1 & \lambda^2 B_{2,2} & \cdots & \lambda^{2\nu-2} B_{2,\nu} & \lambda^{2\nu} B_{2,\nu+1} \\ 0 & B_2 & \cdots & \lambda^{2\nu-4} B_{3,\nu} & \lambda^{2\nu-2} B_{3,\nu+1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & B_\nu & \lambda^2 B_{\nu+1,\nu+1} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{1.14}$$

where $B_{i,j}$ *denotes the* $*$*-block in the* (i,j)*-th position in* (1.3).

More importantly, *we will show that if* $L \in \mathcal{K}_{M,B}$ *then the fundamental solution* Γ^λ *of* L^λ *in* (1.13) *satisfies estimate* (1.11) *uniformly with respect to* $\lambda \in [0,1]$, *that is with the constant* C *dependent only on* M *and* B*:* intuitively, this is due to the fact that, on the one hand, the dilations δ_λ do not affect the blocks $B_1, \dots, B_\nu$ in (1.14) (this guarantees the hypoellipticity of the operator, uniformly with respect to λ); on the other hand, the "new" $*$-blocks in (1.14) are bounded functions of $\lambda \in [0,1]$.

The first step in the proof of (1.11) consists in proving the local boundedness of non-negative weak solutions of equation (1.1) (cf. Theorem 2.2): this result slightly extends the Moser's estimates obtained in Cinti et al. [9] where the lower order terms were not included. From the Moser's estimates we get a Nash upper bound for the fundamental solution in Theorem 3.1. Next we employ a method by Aronson [3] which provides the crucial estimates in Theorem 3.3 and the desired Gaussian upper bound: here we extend the previous scaling argument to non-homogeneous Kolmogorov operators and then prove Theorem 1.4 for the general class $\mathcal{K}_{M,B}$.

2 Moser's iterative method

In this section we adapt the Moser's iterative method to prove the local boundedness of weak solutions of L. In the classical setting, Moser's approach combines Caccioppoli type estimates with the embedding Sobolev inequality: for Kolmogorov operators that are not uniformly parabolic, Caccioppoli estimates provide L^2_{loc}-bounds only for the first m_0 derivatives (cf. Assumption 1.1) and therefore a naive extension of the classical approach is not possible. Nevertheless, this problem can be overcome by using the original argument proposed in [29], that is based on some ad hoc Sobolev type inequalities for local solutions to (1.1).

To introduce the main result of this section, Theorem 2.2 below, we recall the definition of weak solution.

Definition 2.1. *We say that* u *is a* weak sub-solution *of* (1.1) *in a domain* Ω *of* $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ *if*

$$u, \partial_{x_1} u, \dots, \partial_{x_{m_0}} u, Yu \in L^2_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$$

and for any non-negative $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ *we have*

$$\int_\Omega -\langle ADu, D\varphi \rangle - \langle a, D\varphi \rangle u + \varphi c u + \varphi Y u \geq 0.$$

A function u *is a* weak super-solution *if* $-u$ *is a weak sub-solution. If* u *is a weak sub and super-solution, then we say that* u *is a* weak solution.

In the following statement, $R_r(z_0)$ denotes the cylinder

$$R_r(z_0) := z_0 \circ \delta_r(R_1) = \{ z \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \mid z = z_0 \circ \delta_r(\zeta),\, \zeta \in R_1 \}, \qquad z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1},\ r > 0,$$

where

$$R_1 = \{(t,x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \mid |t| < 1,\, |x| < 1\}.$$

Theorem 2.2. *Let $L \in \mathcal{K}_{M,B}$, $\lambda \in [0,1]$ and L^λ as in (1.13). Let u be a non-negative weak solution of $L^\lambda u = 0$ in a domain Ω. Let $z_0 \in \Omega$ and $0 < \varrho < r \leq r_0$ be such that $r - \varrho < 1$ and $\overline{R_r(z_0)} \subseteq \Omega$. Then, for every $p > 0$ there exists a positive constant $C = C(M, r_0, p)$ such that*

$$\sup_{R_\varrho(z_0)} u^p \leq \frac{C}{(r-\varrho)^{Q+2}} \fint_{R_r(z_0)} u^p. \tag{2.1}$$

Estimate (2.1) also holds for every $p < 0$ such that $u^p \in L^1(R_r(z_0))$.

The proof of Theorem 2.2 requires two auxiliary results of independent interest. In the following statement, we use the notation $D_{m_0} = \left(\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_{m_0}}\right)$ and $\|B\|$ for the norm of B as a linear operator.

Theorem 2.3 (Caccioppoli type inequality)**.** *Let $L \in \mathcal{K}_{M,B}$ and u be a non-negative weak sub-solution of (1.1) in $R_r(z_0)$, with $0 < \varrho < r \leq r_0$ such that $r - \varrho < 1$. If $u^q \in L^2(R_r(z_0))$ for some $q > \frac{1}{2}$, then $D_{m_0} u^q \in L^2(R_\rho(z_0))$ and there exists a constant $C = C(M, \|B\|)$ such that*

$$\int_{R_\rho(z_0)} |D_{m_0} u^q|^2 \leq C \left(\frac{q}{2q-1}\right)^2 \frac{q}{(r-\rho)^2} \int_{R_r(z_0)} |u^q|^2. \tag{2.2}$$

If u is a non-negative weak super-solution, then the previous inequality holds for $q < \frac{1}{2}$.

Remark 2.4. *Since C in (2.2) depends only on M and $\|B\|$, then the estimate holds also for L^λ in (1.13), uniformly with respect to $\lambda \in [0,1]$.*

Proof. Let u be a non-negative weak sub-solution of (1.1) in $R_r(z_0)$: this means that

$$\int_{R_r(z_0)} -\langle ADu, D\varphi\rangle - \langle a, D\varphi\rangle u + \varphi c u + \varphi Y u \geq 0 \tag{2.3}$$

for any non-negative $\varphi \in H^1_0(R_r(z_0))$. We choose $q > \frac{1}{2}$ and assume that $u^q \in L^2(R_r(z_0))$. Let $\varphi = 2qu^{2q-1}\psi^2$ in (2.3), where $\psi \in C^\infty_0(R_r(z_0))$; then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle ADu, D\varphi\rangle &= \langle ADu, D(2qu^{2q-1}\psi^2)\rangle \\
&= 2q(2q-1)\psi^2 u^{2q-2}\langle ADu, Du\rangle + 4q\psi u^{2q-1}\langle ADu, D\psi\rangle \\
&= \frac{2(2q-1)}{q}\psi^2\langle ADu^q, Du^q\rangle + 4\psi u^q \langle ADu^q, D\psi\rangle
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{R_r(z_0)} \varphi Y u &= \int_{R_r(z_0)} 2qu^{2q-1}\psi^2 Y u \\
&= \int_{R_r(z_0)} \psi^2 Y(u^{2q}) \\
&= \int_{R_r(z_0)} Y(u^{2q}\psi^2) - 2\psi u^{2q} Y\psi \\
&= \int_{R_r(z_0)} -\mathrm{tr}(B) u^{2q}\psi^2 - 2\psi u^{2q} Y\psi,
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we used the divergence theorem. Moreover,

$$\langle a, D\varphi\rangle u = \langle a, D(2qu^{2q-1}\psi^2)\rangle u$$

$$= 2q(2q-1)\psi^2 u^{2q-1}\langle a, Du\rangle + 4qu^{2q}\psi\langle a, D\psi\rangle$$
$$= 2(2q-1)\psi^2 u^q\langle a, Du^q\rangle + 4qu^{2q}\psi\langle a, D\psi\rangle.$$

Therefore, inequality (2.3) can be rewritten as

$$\int_{R_r(z_0)} \frac{2(2q-1)}{q}\psi^2\langle ADu^q, Du^q\rangle \le \int_{R_r(z_0)} 4u^q|\psi||\langle ADu^q, D\psi\rangle| + 2(2q-1)\psi^2 u^q|\langle a, Du^q\rangle| + \int_{R_r(z_0)} u^{2q}h(\psi),$$

where

$$h(\psi) := |\mathrm{tr}B|\psi^2 + 2|\psi||Y\psi| + 4q|\psi||\langle a, D\psi\rangle| + 2q\psi^2|c|. \tag{2.4}$$

Observe that for any $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$ we have

$$4u^q|\psi||\langle ADu^q, D\psi\rangle| \le 2\varepsilon\psi^2\langle ADu^q, Du^q\rangle + \frac{2}{\varepsilon}u^{2q}\langle AD\psi, D\psi\rangle$$

and

$$2(2q-1)\psi^2 u^q|\langle a, Du^q\rangle| \le 2(2q-1)\psi^2 u^q|a||D_{m_0}u^q| \le \frac{2q-1}{\delta}\psi^2 u^{2q}|a|^2 + \delta(2q-1)\psi^2|D_{m_0}u^q|^2.$$

These estimates give

$$\int_{R_r(z_0)} 2\left(\frac{2q-1}{q} - \varepsilon\right)\psi^2\langle ADu^q, Du^q\rangle \le \int_{R_r(z_0)} \delta(2q-1)\psi^2|D_{m_0}u^q|^2 + \int_{R_r(z_0)} u^{2q}\left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon}\langle AD\psi, D\psi\rangle + \frac{2q-1}{\delta}\psi^2|a|^2 + h(\psi)\right).$$

Now, choose $\varepsilon = \frac{2q-1}{2q}$, which is positive since $q > \frac{1}{2}$, and use Assumption 1.1 on the matrix A to obtain

$$\frac{2q-1}{q\mu}\int_{R_r(z_0)} \psi^2|D_{m_0}u^q|^2 \le \int_{R_r(z_0)} \delta(2q-1)\psi^2|D_{m_0}u^q|^2 + \int_{R_r(z_0)} u^{2q}\left(\frac{4q}{2q-1}\langle AD\psi, D\psi\rangle + \frac{2q-1}{\delta}\psi^2|a|^2 + h(\psi)\right),$$

or equivalently

$$\left(\frac{2q-1}{q\mu} - \delta(2q-1)\right)\int_{R_r(z_0)} \psi^2|D_{m_0}u^q|^2 \le \int_{R_r(z_0)} u^{2q}\left(\frac{4q}{2q-1}\langle AD\psi, D\psi\rangle + \frac{2q-1}{\delta}\psi^2|a|^2 + h(\psi)\right).$$

The choice $\delta = \frac{1}{2q\mu}$ yields

$$\frac{2q-1}{2q\mu}\int_{R_r(z_0)} \psi^2|D_{m_0}u^q|^2 \le \int_{R_r(z_0)} u^{2q}\Big(\frac{4q}{2q-1}\langle AD\psi, D\psi\rangle + 2q\mu(2q-1)\psi^2|a|^2 + h(\psi)\Big). \tag{2.5}$$

The thesis now follows by making a suitable choice of the function ψ. More precisely, if $z_0 = (t_0, x_0)$ we set

$$\psi(t,x) = \chi\left(\sqrt{|t-t_0|}\right)\chi\left(\|z_0^{-1}\circ(x,0)\|\right), \tag{2.6}$$

where $\chi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}, [0,1])$ is such that

$$\chi(s) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if} \quad s \le \rho, \\ 0 & \text{if} \quad s \ge r, \end{cases} \qquad \text{and} \quad |\chi'| \le \frac{2}{r-\rho}.$$

Note that

$$|\partial_t \psi|, \left|\partial_{x_j}\psi\right| \leq \frac{C_1}{r-\rho}, \qquad j = 1, \dots, d,$$

where C_1 is a dimensional constant. With such a choice for ψ, we can bound $h(\psi)$ in (2.4) as

$$|h(\psi)| \leq C\frac{q}{r-\rho}$$

with $C = C(M, \|B\|)$ and inequality (2.5) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{2q-1}{2q\mu}\int_{R_\rho(z_0)} |D_{m_0}u^q|^2 &\leq \int_{R_r(z_0)} u^{2q}\left(\frac{4q\mu}{2q-1}|D_{m_0}\psi|^2 + 2q\mu(2q-1)\|a\|_\infty^2 + |h(\psi)|\right)\\ &\leq \frac{Cq^2}{(2q-1)(r-\rho)^2}\int_{R_r(z_0)} u^{2q},\end{aligned}$$

which corresponds to (2.2). The statement concerning super-solutions is proved similarly. By a standard approximation argument, we can suppose that u is positive; the test function to be used is $\varphi = 2|q|u^{2q-1}\psi^2$ and all the previous inequalities are reversed due to the negativity of $2q-1$. □

We now state and prove the following Sobolev type inequality.

Theorem 2.5 (Sobolev type inequality)**.** *Let $L \in \mathcal{K}_{M,B}$, $\lambda \in [0,1]$ and L^λ as in (1.13). If u is a non-negative weak sub-solution of $L^\lambda u = 0$ in $R_r(z_0)$, then $u \in L^{2\kappa}_{\mathrm{loc}}(R_r(z_0))$ with $\kappa = 1 + \frac{2}{Q}$ and we have*

$$\|u\|_{L^{2\kappa}(R_\rho(z_0))} \leq \frac{C}{r-\rho}\left(\|u\|_{L^2(R_r(z_0))} + \|D_{m_0}u\|_{L^2(R_r(z_0))}\right),$$

for every $0 < \rho < r \leq r_0$, satisfying $r - \varrho < 1$, with C dependent only on M, B and r_0. The same statement holds for non-negative super-solutions.

Proof. We only sketch the proof since it follows closely the idea of the proof of Theorem 3.3 in [29]. First we consider the case $\lambda = 1$: if u is a non-negative sub-solution of (1.1) in $R_r(z_0)$, we represent it in terms of the fundamental solution Γ_0 in (1.10). To this end, we set by $A_0 = \frac{1}{2}\sigma\sigma^*$ with σ as in (1.9) and consider the cut-off function ψ introduced in (2.6). Then, for every $z \in R_\rho(z_0)$ we write

$$\begin{aligned}u(z) &= (u\psi)(z)\\ &= \int\limits_{R_r(z_0)} \left(\langle A_0 D(u\psi), D\Gamma_0(z;\cdot)\rangle - \Gamma_0(z;\cdot)Y(u\psi)\right)(\zeta)d\zeta\\ &= I_1(z) + I_2(z) + I_3(z) + I_4(z),\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}I_1(z) &= \int\limits_{R_r(z_0)} \left(\langle A_0 D\psi, D\Gamma_0(z;\cdot)\rangle u\right)(\zeta)d\zeta - \int\limits_{R_r(z_0)} \left(\Gamma_0(z;\cdot)uY\psi\right)(\zeta)d\zeta,\\ I_2(z) &= \int\limits_{R_r(z_0)} \left(\langle (A_0 - A)\,Du, D\Gamma_0(z;\cdot)\rangle\psi\right)(\zeta)d\zeta - \int\limits_{R_r(z_0)} \left(\Gamma_0(z;\cdot)\langle ADu, D\psi\rangle\right)(\zeta)d\zeta,\\ I_3(z) &= \int\limits_{R_r(z_0)} \left(\langle ADu, D(\Gamma_0(z;\cdot)\psi)\rangle - \Gamma_0(z;\cdot)\psi Yv + \langle a, D(\Gamma_0(z;\cdot)\psi)\rangle u - \Gamma_0(z;\cdot)\psi cu\right)(\zeta)d\zeta.\\ I_4(z) &= \int\limits_{R_r(z_0)} \left(-\langle a, D(\Gamma_0(z;\cdot)\psi)\rangle u + \Gamma_0(z;\cdot)\psi cu\right)(\zeta)d\zeta.\end{aligned}$$

Since u is a weak sub-solution of (1.1), it follows that $I_3 \leq 0$ and therefore

$$0 \leq u \leq I_1 + I_2 + I_4 \qquad \text{a.e. in } R_\rho(z_0).$$

The integrals I_1 and I_2 can be estimated as in the proof of Theorem 3.3 in [29]. For the last term we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_4(z) &= \int\limits_{R_r(z_0)} \left(-\langle a, D(\Gamma_0(z;\cdot)\psi)\rangle u + \Gamma_0(z;\cdot)\psi cu\right)(\zeta)d\zeta \\
&= \int\limits_{R_r(z_0)} \left(-\psi\langle a, D\Gamma_0(z;\cdot)\rangle u - \Gamma_0(z;\cdot)\langle a, D\psi\rangle u + \Gamma_0(z;\cdot)\psi cu\right)(\zeta)d\zeta \\
&= \int\limits_{R_r(z_0)} \left(-\psi\langle a, D\Gamma_0(z;\cdot)\rangle u - \Gamma_0(z;\cdot)u(\langle a, D\psi\rangle - \psi c)\right)(\zeta)d\zeta \\
&= \int\limits_{R_r(z_0)} \left(-\psi\langle a, D\Gamma_0(z;\cdot)\rangle u\right)(\zeta)d\zeta - \int\limits_{R_r(z_0)} \left(\Gamma_0(z;\cdot)u(\langle a, D\psi\rangle - \psi c)\right)(\zeta)d\zeta \\
&=: I_4'(z) + I_4''(z).
\end{aligned}$$

By the potential estimates in [9], Theorem 2, and the Hölder inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\|I_4\|_{L^{2\kappa}(R_\rho(z_0))} &\leq \|I_4'\|_{L^{2\kappa}(R_\rho(z_0))} + \|I_4''\|_{L^{2\kappa}(R_\rho(z_0))} \\
&\leq \|I_4'\|_{L^{2\kappa}(R_\rho(z_0))} + C_2\|I_4''\|_{L^{2\widetilde{\kappa}}(R_\rho(z_0))} \\
&\leq C_1\|u\|_{L^2(R_r(z_0))} + \frac{C_2}{r-\rho}\|u\|_{L^2(R_r(z_0))},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\widetilde{\kappa} = 1 + \frac{4}{Q-2}$, $C_1 = C_1(r_0, B, \|a\|_\infty)$ and $C_2 = C_2(r_0, B, \|a\|_\infty, \|c\|_\infty)$. For the general case when $\lambda \in [0,1]$, the proof is completely analogous and be carried out using the fact that the potential estimates in [9] are uniform in λ.

A similar argument proves the thesis when u is a super-solution. In this case, we introduce the following auxiliary operator

$$\hat{L}_0 = \operatorname{div}(A_0 D) + \hat{Y} \quad \text{where} \quad \hat{Y} := -\langle x, BD\rangle + \partial_t.$$

For any $z = (t,x)$, we set $\hat{z} = (-t,x)$, $v(z) = u(\hat{z})$ and remark that

$$Dv(z) = Du(\hat{z}) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{Y}v(z) = -Yu(\hat{z})$$

almost everywhere. Then, if R is a domain which is symmetric with respect to the time variable t, since u is a super-solution, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int\limits_R \left(-\langle A(\hat{z})Dv, D\varphi\rangle - \langle a(\hat{z}), D\varphi\rangle v + c(\hat{z})\varphi v - \varphi\hat{Y}v\right)(z)dz \\
&= \int\limits_R \left(-\langle A(\hat{z})Du(\hat{z}), D\varphi(z)\rangle - \langle a(\hat{z}), D\varphi(z)\rangle u(\hat{z}) + c(\hat{z})\varphi(z)u(\hat{z}) + \varphi(z)Yu(\hat{z})\right)dz \leq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

for every non-negative $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(R)$. Then, we represent v in terms of the fundamental solution $\hat{\Gamma}_0$ of $\hat{L}_0$ and the proof proceeds as before. □

We are now ready to prove Theorem 2.2.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. As in the proof of Theorem 1 in [9], the argument is based on the Moser's iteration method. The inequality to be iterated is obtained through a combination of Theorem 2.3 and Theorem 2.5, and reads

$$\|u^q\|_{L^{2\kappa}(R_\rho(z_0))} \leq \frac{C(M,r_0,q)\sqrt{|q|}}{(r-\varrho)^2}\|u^q\|_{L^2(R_r(z_0))}, \tag{2.7}$$

where $0<\rho<r\leq r_0$ with $r-\rho<1$, $q\neq\frac{1}{2}$ and u is a non-negative weak solution of $L^\lambda u=0$. From Theorem 2.3 we see that $C(M,r_0,q)$, as a function of q, is bounded at infinity and diverges at $q=\frac{1}{2}$: this feature is in common with the equation studied in [9]. However, the presence of the new factor $\sqrt{|q|}$ in the right hand side of (2.7) requires additional care in the application of the Moser's iterative procedure. First of all, we fix a sequence of radii $\rho_n=\left(1-\frac{1}{2^n}\right)\rho+\frac{1}{2^n}r$, a sequence of exponents $q_n=\frac{p}{2}\kappa^n$ and a safety distance, say δ, from $\frac{1}{2}$. The exponent p is chosen to guarantee that the distance of the resulting exponent q_n from $\frac{1}{2}$ is at least δ, for each $n\geq 1$. We then iterate inequality (2.7) to obtain

$$\|u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^\infty(R_\rho(z_0))}\leq f(r-\varrho)\|u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^2(R_r(z_0))}$$

where, for some $\widetilde{C}=\widetilde{C}(M,r_0,\delta)$,

$$f(r-\varrho)=\prod_{j=0}^{\infty}\left(\frac{\widetilde{C}\sqrt{|p|}\kappa^{\frac{j}{2}}}{(\varrho_j-\varrho_{j+1})^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{\kappa^j}}=\frac{C_1(M,r_0,p)}{(r-\varrho)^{\frac{Q+2}{2}}},$$

This proves inequality (2.1) for p satisfying $|\frac{p}{2}k^n-\frac{1}{2}|\geq\delta$. The previous restriction is easily relaxed using the monotonicity of the L^p-means (see [9] for details). □

Remark 2.6. *The previous proof can be slightly modified to see that Moser's estimate* (2.1) *still holds true on the cylinder* $R_r^+(z_0):=z_0\circ\delta_r\left(R_1^+\right)$ *with* $R_1^+=\{(t,x)\in\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d\mid 0<t<1,\,|x|<1\}$.

3 Gaussian upper bound

In this section we prove a Gaussian upper bound for the fundamental solution Γ of $L\in\mathcal{K}_{M,B}$. We begin with an important implication of the Moser's estimate (2.1).

Theorem 3.1 (Nash upper bound)**.** *Let* Γ *be the fundamental solution of* $L\in\mathcal{K}_{M,B}$*. Then, there exists a positive constant* $C=C(M,T_0)$ *such that*

$$\Gamma(t,x;T,y)\leq\frac{C}{(T-t)^{\frac{Q}{2}}},\qquad 0<T-t\leq T_0,\ x,y\in\mathbb{R}^d.$$

Proof. By Theorem 2.2, with $\varrho=\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{T-t}{\max\{T_0,1\}}}$ and $r=\sqrt{2}\varrho$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma(t,x;T,y)&\leq\sup_{R_\varrho(t,x)}\Gamma(\cdot,\cdot;T,y)\\&\leq\frac{C}{(T-t)^{\frac{Q+2}{2}}}\iint\limits_{R_r(t,x)}\Gamma(s,\xi;T,y)d\xi ds\\&\leq\frac{C}{(T-t)^{\frac{Q+2}{2}}}\int\limits_{t-\frac{T-t}{2\max\{T_0,1\}}}^{t+\frac{T-t}{2\max\{T_0,1\}}}\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Gamma(s,\xi;T,y)d\xi ds\end{aligned}$$

(since $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(s,\xi;T,y)d\xi ds \le e^{(T-s)\|c\|_\infty}$)

$$\le \frac{C}{(T-t)^{\frac{Q}{2}}}.$$

□

An immediate consequence of Theorem 3.1 is the following

Corollary 3.2. *There exists a positive constant $C = C(M, T_0)$ such that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma^2(t,x;T,y)dy \le \frac{C}{(T-t)^{\frac{Q}{2}}}, \qquad 0 < T-t \le T_0,\ x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma^2(t,x;T,y)dx \le \frac{C}{(T-t)^{\frac{Q}{2}}}, \qquad 0 < T-t \le T_0,\ y \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Our proof of a Gaussian upper bound for the fundamental solution is adapted to Aronson's method [3]. The next theorem is a crucial step in this direction.

Theorem 3.3. *Fix $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\sigma > 0$ and let $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be such that $u_0(x) = 0$ for $|x-y| < \sigma$. Let $L \in \mathcal{K}_{M,B}$ and suppose that u is a bounded solution to (1.1) in $[\eta - \sigma^2, \eta[\times \mathbb{R}^d$ with terminal value $u(\eta, x) = u_0(x)$. Then, there exist positive constants k and C such that for any τ which satisfies $\eta - \frac{1\wedge\sigma^2}{k} \le \tau \le \eta$ we have*

$$|u((0, e^{-\eta B}y) \circ (\tau, 0))| \le C(\eta-\tau)^{-\frac{Q}{4}} \exp\left(-\frac{\sigma^2}{C(\eta-\tau)}\right) \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \tag{3.1}$$

The constants k and C depend only on M.

Proof. We first prove the thesis for $y = 0$. We fix s such that $0 \le \eta - s \le 1 \wedge \sigma^2$ and we define

$$h(t,x) = -\frac{|x|^2}{2(\eta-s) - k(\eta-t)} + \alpha(\eta-t), \qquad \eta - \frac{\eta-s}{k} \le t \le \eta,\ x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

with α and k being positive constants to be fixed later on. Moreover, for $R \ge 2$, we consider a function $\gamma_R \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, [0,1])$ such that $\gamma_R(x) \equiv 1$ for $|x| \le R-1$, $\gamma_R(x) \equiv 0$ for $|x| \ge R$ with $|D\gamma_R|$ bounded by a constant independent of R. Then, we multiply both sides of (1.1) by $\gamma_R^2 e^{2h} u$ and we integrate over $[\tau, \eta] \times \mathbb{R}^d$, with $\eta - \frac{\eta-s}{k} \le \tau \le \eta$, to get

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \gamma_R^2 e^{2h} u^2|_{t=\tau}\, dx - 2 \iint_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d} e^{2h}u^2 \left(3\langle AD_{m_0}h, D_{m_0}h\rangle - Yh - 2\langle a, D_{m_0}h\rangle + \Lambda\right) dxdt \le \\ &\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \gamma_R^2 e^{2h} u^2|_{t=\eta}\, dx + 2 \iint_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d} e^{2h}u^2 \left(3\mu\left|D_{m_0}\gamma_R\right|^2 + \left|Y\gamma_R^2\right| - 2\langle a, D_{m_0}\gamma_R\rangle\gamma_R\right) dxdt, \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

where Λ is a positive constant depending on M. The proof of (3.2) is tedious but routine: all the details are reported in Appendix A.

Next we let R go to infinity in (3.2): since u is bounded by assumption and $e^{2h(t,x)} \le e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{\eta-s} + 2\alpha(\eta-s)}$, the last integral tends to zero and we get

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{2h}u^2|_{t=\tau}\, dx - 2 \iint_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d} e^{2h}u^2 \left(3\langle AD_{m_0}h, D_{m_0}h\rangle - Yh - 2\langle a, D_{m_0}h\rangle + \Lambda\right) dxdt \le \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{2h}u^2|_{t=\eta}\, dx. \tag{3.3}$$

We now claim that, by a suitable choice of k and α, only dependent on M, B, we have

$$3\langle AD_{m_0}h, D_{m_0}h\rangle - Yh - 2\langle a, D_{m_0}h\rangle + \Lambda \le 0, \qquad \eta - \frac{\eta - s}{k} \le t \le \eta,\ x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{3.4}$$

Indeed, letting $\delta = 2(\eta - s) - k(\eta - t)$ to ease the notation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 3\langle AD_{m_0}h, D_{m_0}h\rangle - Yh - 2\langle a, D_{m_0}h\rangle + \Lambda &\le \frac{12\mu|x|^2}{\delta^2} + \frac{2\,\|B\|\,|x|^2}{\delta} - \frac{k|x|^2}{\delta^2} - \alpha + \frac{4\langle a, x\rangle}{\delta} + \Lambda \\ &\le \frac{|x|^2}{\delta^2}(12\mu + 2\delta\,\|B\| - k + 2) - \alpha + 2\,\|a\|_\infty^2 + \Lambda \\ &\le \frac{|x|^2}{\delta^2}(12\mu + 4\,\|B\| - k + 2) - \alpha + 2\,\|a\|_\infty^2 + \Lambda, \end{aligned}$$

and, with $\alpha = 2\,\|a\|_\infty^2 + \Lambda$ and k big enough, the last term can be made negative.

From (3.4) and (3.3), we derive the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{t\in\,]\eta - \frac{\eta-s}{k}, \eta[} \int\limits_{\left|D\left(\frac{2\sqrt{k}}{\sqrt{\eta-s}}\right)x\right| \le 1} e^{2h(t,x)}u^2(t,x)dx &\le \max_{t\in\,]\eta - \frac{\eta-s}{k}, \eta[} \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{2h(t,x)}u^2(t,x)dx \\ &\le \int\limits_{|x|\ge\sigma} e^{2h(\eta,x)}u_0^2(x)dx. \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

Now we notice that, by definition, for every $t \in\,]\eta - \frac{\eta-s}{k}, \eta]$ we have

$$2h(t,x) \ge -\frac{2|x|^2}{\eta - s} =$$

(setting $\delta = \frac{\sqrt{\eta-s}}{2\sqrt{k}}$)

$$= -\frac{2\left|\mathcal{D}(\delta)\mathcal{D}(\delta^{-1})x\right|^2}{\eta - s} \ge$$

(if $\left|D\left(\frac{2\sqrt{k}}{\sqrt{\eta-s}}\right)x\right| = \left|\mathcal{D}\left(\delta^{-1}\right)x\right| \le 1$)

$$\ge -\frac{2\,\|\mathcal{D}(\delta)\|^2}{\eta - s} \ge$$

(since $\delta < 1$ by assumption)

$$\ge -\frac{2\delta^2}{\eta - s} = -\frac{1}{2k}. \tag{3.6}$$

On the other hand, if $|x| \ge \sigma$, we have

$$-2h(\eta, x) = \frac{2|x|^2}{2(\eta - s)} \ge \frac{\sigma^2}{\eta - s}. \tag{3.7}$$

Plugging estimates (3.6) and (3.7) into (3.5), we get

$$\max_{t\in]\eta - \frac{\eta-s}{k}, \eta[} \int\limits_{\left|D\left(\frac{2\sqrt{k}}{\sqrt{\eta-s}}\right)x\right| \le 1} u^2(t,x)dx \le e^{\frac{1}{2k}} \exp\left(-\frac{\sigma^2}{\eta - s}\right) \|u_0\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \tag{3.8}$$

Finally, we rely on Theorem 2.2 in order to get the desired estimate (3.1). We let $\tau = \eta - \frac{\eta-s}{k}$ and we observe that $\tau \in [\eta - \frac{1}{k}, \eta]$ and $\eta - s = k(\eta - \tau)$: thus we have

$$|u(\tau, 0)|^2 \le \sup_{R^+_{\frac{\sqrt{\eta-s}}{4\sqrt{k}}}(\tau,0)} |u|^2 \le$$

(by (2.1))

$$\leq \frac{C}{(\eta-s)^{\frac{Q+2}{2}}} \iint\limits_{R^+_{\frac{\sqrt{\eta-s}}{2\sqrt{k}}}(\tau,0)} u^2(t,x)dxdt$$

$$= \frac{C}{(\eta-s)^{\frac{Q+2}{2}}} \int\limits_{\tau}^{\tau+\frac{\eta-s}{4k}} \int\limits_{\left|D\left(\frac{2\sqrt{k}}{\sqrt{\eta-s}}\right)x\right|\leq 1} u^2(t,x)dxdt$$

(by (3.8))

$$\leq \frac{C}{(\eta-s)^{\frac{Q}{2}}} \exp\left(-\frac{\sigma^2}{C(\eta-s)}\right) \|u_0\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}$$

$$= \frac{C}{k^{\frac{Q}{2}}(\eta-\tau)^{\frac{Q}{2}}} \exp\left(-\frac{\sigma^2}{Ck(\eta-\tau)}\right) \|u_0\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)},$$

where the constant $C = C(M,k)$. This yields (3.1) in the case $y = 0$.

For the general case, for any fixed u, u_0 and (η, y) as in the statement, we set

$$v(\tau,x) = u\left((0,e^{-\eta B}y)\circ(\tau,x)\right) \qquad \tau<\eta,\ x\in\mathbb{R}^d,$$

and observe that $v(\eta,x) = u(\eta,y+x) = u_0(y+x) = 0$ for $|x|\leq\sigma$. Moreover, by the invariance property of the vector field Y with respect to the left translation ℓ_z, we have $L^{(z)}v = 0$, where $L^{(z)} := L\circ\ell_z \in \mathcal{K}_{M,B}$ and $z = (0,e^{-\eta B}y)$. Thus, we get as before

$$|u(z\circ(\tau,0))| = |v(\tau,0)| \leq \frac{C}{(\eta-\tau)^{\frac{Q}{4}}} \exp\left(-\frac{\sigma^2}{C(\eta-\tau)}\right) \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}$$

completing the proof. □

The following corollary is a simple consequence of Theorems 3.3.

Corollary 3.4. *There exists two positive constants k and C, that depend only on M, such that for every $\sigma>0$ and $\eta\in\mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$\int\limits_{\left|\xi-e^{(\eta-t)B}x\right|\geq\sigma} \Gamma^2(t,x;\eta,\xi)d\xi \leq \frac{Ce^{-\frac{\sigma^2}{C(\eta-t)}}}{(\eta-t)^{\frac{Q}{2}}}, \qquad (t,x)\in\left]\eta-\frac{1\wedge\sigma^2}{k},\eta\right]\times\mathbb{R}^d, \tag{3.9}$$

and

$$\int\limits_{\left|x-e^{(t-\eta)B}\xi\right|\geq\sigma} \Gamma^2(t,x;\eta,\xi)dx \leq \frac{Ce^{-\frac{\sigma^2}{C(\eta-t)}}}{(\eta-t)^{\frac{Q}{2}}}, \qquad (t,x)\in\left]\eta-\frac{1\wedge\sigma^2}{k},\eta\right]\times\mathbb{R}^d. \tag{3.10}$$

Proof. First of all we observe that

$$\int\limits_{\left|\xi-e^{(\eta-t)B}x\right|\geq\sigma} \Gamma^2(t,x;\eta,\xi)d\xi = \int\limits_{|\xi-y|\geq\sigma} \Gamma^2\left(t,e^{(t-\eta)B}y;\eta,\xi\right)d\xi$$

$$= \int\limits_{|\xi-y|\geq\sigma} \Gamma^2\left((0,e^{-\eta B}y)\circ(t,0);\eta,\xi\right)d\xi.$$

Now the function

$$u(s,w) := \int\limits_{|\xi-y|\geq\sigma} \Gamma(s,w;\eta,\xi)\Gamma((0,e^{-\eta B}y)\circ(t,0);\eta,\xi)d\xi,$$

is a non-negative solution to (1.1) for $s < \eta$, with terminal condition

$$u(\eta, w) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |w - y| < \sigma, \\ \Gamma((0, e^{-\eta B}y) \circ (t, 0); \eta, w) & \text{if } |w - y| \geq \sigma. \end{cases}$$

Setting $(s, w) = (0, e^{-\eta B}y) \circ (t, 0)$, from Theorem 3.3 we infer

$$\begin{aligned} \int\limits_{|\xi - y| \geq \sigma} \Gamma^2 \left((0, e^{-\eta B}y) \circ (t, 0); \eta, \xi\right) d\xi &= u((0, e^{-\eta B}y) \circ (t, 0)) \\ &\leq \frac{Ce^{-\frac{\sigma^2}{C(\eta - t)}}}{(\eta - t)^{\frac{Q}{4}}} \| \Gamma\left((0, e^{-\eta B}y) \circ (t, 0), \eta, \cdot\right) \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \end{aligned}$$

Then the thesis follows directly from Corollary 3.2. Inequality (3.10) is proved similarly. □

We are now in position to prove our main result.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. The proof proceeds in a series of steps.

Step 1. We first prove the thesis for $y = 0$ and $T - t = \frac{1}{k}$, with k as in Theorem 3.3. We fix $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and set

$$\sigma(x) = \frac{|x|}{2\|e^{\frac{T-t}{2}B}\|}. \tag{3.11}$$

If $\sigma(x) \leq 1$, that is $|x| \leq 2\|e^{\frac{T-t}{2}B}\|$, then the thesis is a direct consequence of Theorem 3.1 and the fact that, by assumption, $T - t = \frac{1}{k}$ is fixed with k dependent only upon M.

On the other hand, if $\sigma(x) \geq 1$, by the Chapman-Kolmogorov identity and putting $\eta = T - \frac{T-t}{2}$, we have

$$\Gamma(t, x; T, 0) = \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(t, x; \eta, \xi)\Gamma(\eta, \xi; T, 0) d\xi = J_1 + J_2,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &:= \int\limits_{\left|\xi - e^{\frac{T-t}{2}B}x\right| \geq \sigma(x)} \Gamma(t, x; \eta, \xi)\Gamma(\eta, \xi; T, 0) d\xi, \\ J_2 &:= \int\limits_{\left|\xi - e^{\frac{T-t}{2}B}x\right| < \sigma(x)} \Gamma(t, x; \eta, \xi)\Gamma(\eta, \xi; T, 0) d\xi. \end{aligned}$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$(J_1)^2 \leq \int\limits_{\left|\xi - e^{\frac{T-t}{2}B}x\right| \geq \sigma(x)} \Gamma^2(t, x; \eta, \xi) d\xi \int\limits_{\left|\xi - e^{\frac{T-t}{2}B}x\right| \geq \sigma(x)} \Gamma^2(\eta, \xi; T, 0) d\xi$$

(by (3.9) and Corollary 3.2)

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \frac{Ce^{-\frac{\sigma^2(x)}{C(T-t)}}}{(T - t)^Q} \\ &= Ck^Q \exp\left(-\frac{k|x|^2}{4C\|e^{\frac{1}{2k}B}\|^2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

In order to estimate J_2, we first note that if $\left|\xi - e^{\frac{T-t}{2}B}x\right| < \sigma(x)$ then, recalling also the definition (3.11) of $\sigma(x)$, we have

$$|\xi| \geq \left|e^{-\frac{T-t}{2}}x\right| - \left|\xi - e^{-\frac{T-t}{2}}x\right| \geq \frac{|x|}{\|e^{\frac{T-t}{2}B}\|} - \sigma(x) = \sigma(x). \tag{3.12}$$

Thus, by (3.12) and using again the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$(J_2)^2 \leq \int\limits_{|\xi|\geq\sigma(x)} \Gamma^2(\eta,\xi;T,0)d\xi \int\limits_{|\xi|\geq\sigma(x)} \Gamma^2(t,x;\eta,\xi)d\xi$$

(by (3.10))

$$\leq \frac{Ce^{-\frac{\sigma^2(x)}{C(T-t)}}}{(T-t)^{\frac{Q}{2}}} \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma^2(t,x;\eta,\xi)d\xi$$

(by Corollary 3.2)

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \frac{C}{(T-t)^Q} e^{-\frac{\sigma^2(x)}{C(T-t)}} \\ &= Ck^Q \exp\left(-\frac{k|x|^2}{4C\|e^{\frac{1}{2k}B}\|^2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the case $\sigma(x) \geq 1$. In conclusion we have proved estimate (1.5) for $T-t = \frac{1}{k}$, that is

$$\Gamma(t,x;T,0) \leq Ce^{-\frac{|x|^2}{C}}, \qquad T-t = \frac{1}{k},\ x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{3.13}$$

with the constant C only dependent on M and B. Actually, the same estimate holds also for the fundamental solution Γ^λ of L^λ in (1.13), *with C independent of $\lambda \in [0,1]$:* in fact, all the results of this section derive from the Moser's estimate, Theorem 2.2, which is uniform in $\lambda \in [0,1]$.

Step 2. We use a scaling argument to generalize estimate (3.13) to the case $0 < T-t \leq \frac{1}{k}$; precisely, we prove that

$$\Gamma(t,x;T,0) \leq \frac{C}{(T-t)^{\frac{Q}{2}}} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{C(T-t)}}, \qquad 0 < T-t \leq \frac{1}{k},\ x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{3.14}$$

For $\lambda \in [0,1]$, we set

$$\Gamma^\lambda(t,x;T,0) = \lambda^Q \Gamma(\delta_\lambda(t,x);\delta_\lambda(T,0))$$

and observe that, since the Jacobian $J\mathcal{D}(\lambda)$ equals λ^Q, we have that Γ^λ is a fundamental solution of the operator $L^{(\lambda)}$ in (1.13).

Now, fix t such that $0 < T-t \leq \frac{1}{k}$ and set $\lambda = k(T-t)$. Then we have

$$\Gamma(t,x;T,0) = \lambda^{-\frac{Q}{2}} \Gamma^{(\sqrt{\lambda})}\left(\frac{t}{\lambda}, \mathcal{D}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}\right)x; \frac{T}{\lambda}, 0\right) \leq$$

(by (3.13))

$$\leq C\lambda^{-\frac{Q}{2}} e^{-\frac{1}{C}\left|\mathcal{D}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}\right)x\right|^2}$$

which proves (3.14).

Step 3. We now remove the condition $y = 0$. Let $z = (0, e^{-TB}y)$ and $\Gamma^{(z)}$ be the fundamental solution of the operator $L^{(z)} := L \circ \ell_z$. Since $L^{(z)} \in \mathcal{K}_{M,B}$, we have that $\Gamma^{(z)}$ satisfies the estimate (3.14) and hence we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma(t,x;T,y) &= \Gamma^{(z)}(z^{-1}\circ(t,x);T,0)\\ &= \Gamma^{(z)}(t,x-e^{-(T-t)B}y;T,0)\\ &\leq \frac{C}{(T-t)^{\frac{Q}{2}}}\exp\left(-\frac{1}{C}\left|\mathcal{D}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T-t}}\right)\left(x-e^{-(T-t)B}y\right)\right|^2\right), \qquad 0<T-t\leq\frac{1}{k},\ x,y\in\mathbb{R}^d.\end{aligned}$$

Step 4. In the last step we relax the restriction on the length of the time interval. We first suppose that $0 < T - t \leq \frac{2}{k}$ and set $\tau = \frac{T-t}{2}$. By the Chapman-Kolmogorov identity we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma(t,x;T,y) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Gamma(t,x;t+\tau,\xi)\Gamma(t+\tau,\xi;T,y)d\xi\\ &\leq \frac{C}{\tau^Q}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\frac{1}{C}\left|\mathcal{D}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\tau}}\right)\left(x-e^{-\tau B}\xi\right)\right|^2} e^{-\frac{1}{C}\left|\mathcal{D}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\tau}}\right)\left(\xi-e^{-\tau B}y\right)\right|^2} d\xi\\ &\leq \frac{C}{\tau^Q}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\frac{1}{C}\left|\mathcal{D}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\tau}}\right)\left(x-e^{-\tau B}\xi\right)\right|^2} e^{-\frac{1}{C}\left|\mathcal{D}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\tau}}\right)\left(e^{-\tau B}\xi-e^{-(T-t)B}y\right)\right|^2} d\xi\end{aligned}$$

(by the Chapman-Kolmogorov identity for a standard Gaussian kernel)

$$\leq \frac{C}{(T-t)^{\frac{Q}{2}}} e^{-\frac{1}{C}\left|\mathcal{D}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T-t}}\right)\left(x-e^{-(T-t)B}y\right)\right|^2}.$$

Iterating this procedure we can extend the estimate to any bounded time interval and this concludes the proof. □

Appendix A

The proof of estimate (3.2) is based on standard integration by parts and the repeated use of the chain rule and the elementary inequality $2|\alpha\beta| \leq \delta\alpha^2 + \frac{\beta^2}{\delta}$. We start multiplying both sides of (1.1) by $\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}u$ and integrating over $[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d$: we get

$$\begin{aligned}0 &= \iint_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d}\operatorname{div}(ADu)\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}u + \iint_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d}(Yu)\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}u + \iint_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d}\operatorname{div}(au)\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}u + \iint_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d} cu^2\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}\\ &=: \mathbf{I}_1+\mathbf{I}_2+\mathbf{I}_3+\mathbf{I}_4. \qquad (A.1)\end{aligned}$$

Now, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{I}_1 &= -\iint_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d}\langle ADu, D(\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}u)\rangle\\ &= -\iint_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d} 2\langle ADu, D\gamma_R\rangle\gamma_R e^{2h}u + 2\langle ADu, Dh\rangle\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}u + \langle ADu, Du\rangle\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}\\ &\leq \iint_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d}\frac{1}{3}\langle ADu, Du\rangle\gamma_R^2 e^{2h} + 3\langle AD\gamma_R, D\gamma_R\rangle u^2 e^{2h}\\ &\quad + \iint_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d}\frac{1}{3}\langle ADu, Du\rangle\gamma_R^2 e^{2h} + 3\langle ADh, Dh\rangle\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}u^2 - \iint_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d}\langle ADu, Du\rangle\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \iint\limits_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d} -\frac{1}{3}\langle ADu, Du\rangle\gamma_R^2 e^{2h} + 3\langle AD\gamma_R, D\gamma_R\rangle u^2 e^{2h} + 3\langle ADh, Dh\rangle\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}u^2 \\
&\le \iint\limits_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d} -\frac{1}{3\mu}|D_{m_0}u|^2\gamma_R^2 e^{2h} + 3\langle AD\gamma_R, D\gamma_R\rangle u^2 e^{2h} + 3\langle ADh, Dh\rangle\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}u^2;
\end{aligned}
$$

moreover, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{I}_2 =& \frac{1}{2}\iint\limits_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d} \gamma_R^2 e^{2h} Y u^2 \\
=& \frac{1}{2}\iint\limits_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d} \gamma_R^2 e^{2h}(\langle Bx, D\rangle + \partial_t)u^2 \\
=& -\frac{1}{2}\iint\limits_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d} u^2\langle Bx, D(\gamma_R^2 e^{2h})\rangle + u^2\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}\mathrm{tr}B \\
&+ \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u^2\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}|_\tau^\eta - \iint\limits_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d} u^2\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}\partial_t h \\
=& -\iint\limits_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d} u^2\langle Bx, D\gamma_R\rangle\gamma_R e^{2h} + u^2\langle Bx, Dh\rangle\gamma_R^2 e^{2h} + u^2\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}\mathrm{tr}B \\
&+ \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u^2\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}|_\tau^\eta - \iint\limits_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d} u^2\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}\partial_t h \\
=& -\iint\limits_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d} u^2\langle Bx, D\gamma_R\rangle\gamma_R e^{2h} + u^2\gamma_R^2 e^{2h} Yh + u^2\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}\mathrm{tr}B + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u^2\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}|_\tau^\eta;
\end{aligned}
$$

finally, we also have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{I}_3 =& \iint\limits_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d} \mathrm{div}(au)\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}u \\
=& -\iint\limits_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d} u\langle a, D(\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}u)\rangle \\
=& -\iint\limits_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d} 2u^2\gamma_R e^{2h}\langle a, D\gamma_R\rangle + 2u^2\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}\langle a, Dh\rangle + u\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}\langle a, Du\rangle \\
\le& -\iint\limits_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d} 2u^2\gamma_R e^{2h}\langle a, D\gamma_R\rangle + 2u^2\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}\langle a, Dh\rangle + \iint\limits_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\delta}{2}|D_{m_0}u|^2\gamma_R^2 e^{2h} + \frac{1}{2\delta}|a|^2u^2\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Plugging the above estimates into (A.1), we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 =& \mathbf{I}_1 + \mathbf{I}_2 + \mathbf{I}_3 + \mathbf{I}_4 \\
\le& \iint\limits_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d} -\frac{1}{3\mu}|D_{m_0}u|^2\gamma_R^2 e^{2h} + 3\langle AD\gamma_R, D\gamma_R\rangle u^2 e^{2h} + 3\langle ADh, Dh\rangle\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}u^2 \\
&- \iint\limits_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d} u^2\langle Bx, D\gamma_R\rangle\gamma_R e^{2h} + u^2\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}(Yh + \mathrm{tr}B) + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u^2\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}|_\tau^\eta \\
&- \iint\limits_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d} 2u^2\gamma_R e^{2h}\langle a, D\gamma_R\rangle + 2u^2\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}\langle a, Dh\rangle + \iint\limits_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\delta}{2}|D_{m_0}u|^2\gamma_R^2 e^{2h} + \frac{1}{2\delta}|a|^2u^2\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$+ \iint\limits_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d} cu^2\gamma_R^2 e^{2h},$$

and by choosing $\delta = \frac{2}{3\mu}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u^2\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}|_\tau \leq \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u^2\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}|_\eta &+ \iint\limits_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d} 3\langle AD\gamma_R, D\gamma_R\rangle u^2 e^{2h} + 3\langle ADh, Dh\rangle\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}u^2 \\
&- \iint\limits_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d} u^2\langle Bx, D\gamma_R\rangle\gamma_R e^{2h} + u^2\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}(Yh + \mathrm{tr}B) \\
&- \iint\limits_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d} 2u^2\gamma_R e^{2h}\langle a, D\gamma_R\rangle + 2u^2\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}\langle a, Dh\rangle + \iint\limits_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{3\mu}{4}|a|^2 u^2\gamma_R^2 e^{2h} \\
&+ \iint\limits_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d} cu^2\gamma_R^2 e^{2h} \\
= \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u^2\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}|_\eta &+ \iint\limits_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d} (3\langle AD\gamma_R, D\gamma_R\rangle - \langle Bx, D\gamma_R\rangle\gamma_R - 2\gamma_R\langle a, D\gamma_R\rangle)u^2 e^{2h} \\
&+ \iint\limits_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d} (3\langle ADh, Dh\rangle - Yh - 2\langle a, Dh\rangle + \frac{3\mu}{4}|a|^2 + c - \mathrm{tr}B)u^2\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, setting $\Lambda = \frac{3\mu}{4}\|a\|_\infty^2 + \|c\|_\infty + |\mathrm{tr}B|$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u^2\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}|_\tau \leq \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u^2\gamma_R^2 e^{2h}|_\eta &+ \iint\limits_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d} (3\langle AD\gamma_R, D\gamma_R\rangle - \langle Bx, D\gamma_R\rangle\gamma_R - 2\gamma_R\langle a, D\gamma_R\rangle)u^2 e^{2h} \\
&+ \iint\limits_{[\tau,\eta]\times\mathbb{R}^d} (3\langle ADh, Dh\rangle - Yh - 2\langle a, Dh\rangle + \Lambda)u^2\gamma_R^2 e^{2h},
\end{aligned}$$

which yields estimate (3.2).

References

[1] F. Antonelli, E. Barucci, and M. E. Mancino, *Asset pricing with a forward-backward stochastic differential utility*, Econom. Lett., 72 (2001), pp. 151–157.

[2] F. Antonelli and A. Pascucci, *On the viscosity solutions of a stochastic differential utility problem*, J. Differential Equations, 186 (2002), pp. 69–87.

[3] D. G. Aronson, *Bounds for the fundamental solution of a parabolic equation*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc., 73 (1967), pp. 890–896.

[4] V. Bally and A. Kohatsu-Higa, *A probabilistic interpretation of the parametrix method*, Ann. Appl. Probab., 25 (2015), pp. 3095–3138.

[5] E. Barucci, S. Polidoro, and V. Vespri, *Some results on partial differential equations and Asian options*, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci., 11 (2001), pp. 475–497.

[6] M. Bossy, J.-F. Jabir, and D. Talay, *On conditional McKean Lagrangian stochastic models*, Probab. Theory Related Fields, 151 (2011), pp. 319–351.

[7] C. Cercignani, *The Boltzmann equation and its applications*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1988.

[8] C. Chiarella and O. Kwon, *A complete Markovian stochastic volatility model in the HJM framework*, Asia-Pacific Financial Markets, 7 (2000), pp. 293–304.

[9] C. Cinti, A. Pascucci, and S. Polidoro, *Pointwise estimates for a class of non-homogeneous Kolmogorov equations*, Math. Ann., 340 (2008), pp. 237–264.

[10] E. B. Davies, *Explicit constants for Gaussian upper bounds on heat kernels*, Amer. J. Math., 109 (1987), pp. 319–333.

[11] L. Desvillettes and C. Villani, *On the trend to global equilibrium in spatially inhomogeneous entropy-dissipating systems: the linear Fokker-Planck equation*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 54 (2001), pp. 1–42.

[12] M. Di Francesco and A. Pascucci, *On a class of degenerate parabolic equations of Kolmogorov type*, AMRX Appl. Math. Res. Express, (2005), pp. 77–116.

[13] M. Di Francesco and S. Polidoro, *Schauder estimates, Harnack inequality and Gaussian lower bound for Kolmogorov-type operators in non-divergence form*, Adv. Differential Equations, 11 (2006), pp. 1261–1320.

[14] S. D. Eidelman, S. D. Ivasyshen, and H. P. Malytska, *A modified Levi method: development and application*, Dopov. Nats. Akad. Nauk Ukr. Mat. Prirodozn. Tekh. Nauki, 5 (1998), pp. 14–19.

[15] E. B. Fabes, *Gaussian upper bounds on fundamental solutions of parabolic equations; the method of Nash*, in Dirichlet forms (Varenna, 1992), vol. 1563 of Lecture Notes in Math., Springer, Berlin, 1993, pp. 1–20.

[16] D. G. Hobson and L. C. G. Rogers, *Complete models with stochastic volatility*, Math. Finance, 8 (1998), pp. 27–48.

[17] A. M. Il′in, *On a class of ultraparabolic equations*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR, 159 (1964), pp. 1214–1217.

[18] V. Konakov, S. Menozzi, and S. Molchanov, *Explicit parametrix and local limit theorems for some degenerate diffusion processes*, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat., 46 (2010), pp. 908—923.

[19] L. P. Kupcov, *The fundamental solutions of a certain class of elliptic-parabolic second order equations*, Differencial′nye Uravnenija, 8 (1972), pp. 1649–1660, 1716.

[20] E. Lanconelli and S. Polidoro, *On a class of hypoelliptic evolution operators*, Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Politec. Torino, 52 (1994), pp. 29–63.

[21] P. Langevin, *On the theory of Brownian motion*, C. R. Acad. Sci. (Paris), (1908), pp. 530–533.

[22] P.-L. Lions, *On Boltzmann and Landau equations*, Philos. Trans. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A, 346 (1994), pp. 191–204.

[23] A. Lunardi, *Schauder estimates for a class of degenerate elliptic and parabolic operators with unbounded coefficients in* $\mathbb{R}^N$, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4), 24 (1997), pp. 133–164.

[24] M. Manfredini, *The Dirichlet problem for a class of ultraparabolic equations*, Adv. Differential Equations, 2 (1997), pp. 831–866.

[25] D. Morbidelli, *Spazi frazionari di tipo Sobolev per campi vettoriali e operatori di evoluzione di tipo Kolmogorov-Fokker-Planck*, Tesi di Dottorato di Ricerca, Università di Bologna, (1998).

[26] J. Nash, *Continuity of solutions of parabolic and elliptic equations*, Amer. J. Math., 80 (1958), pp. 931–954.

[27] A. Pascucci, *PDE and martingale methods in option pricing*, vol. 2 of Bocconi & Springer Series, Springer, Milan; Bocconi University Press, Milan, 2011.

[28] A. Pascucci and S. Polidoro, *A Gaussian upper bound for the fundamental solutions of a class of ultraparabolic equations*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 282 (2003), pp. 396–409.

[29] ——, *The Moser's iterative method for a class of ultraparabolic equations*, Commun. Contemp. Math., 6 (2004), pp. 395–417.

[30] R. Peszek, *PDE models for pricing stocks and options with memory feedback*, Appl. Math. Finance, 2 (1995), pp. 211–223.

[31] S. Polidoro, *On a class of ultraparabolic operators of Kolmogorov-Fokker-Planck type*, Matematiche (Catania), 49 (1994), pp. 53–105.

[32] ——, *A global lower bound for the fundamental solution of Kolmogorov-Fokker-Planck equations*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., 137 (1997), pp. 321–340.

[33] H. Risken, *The Fokker-Planck equation: Methods of solution and applications*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second ed., 1989.

[34] P. Ritchken and L. Sankarasubramanian, *Volatility structures of forward rates and the dynamics of the term structure*, Math. Finance, 5 (1995), pp. 55–72.

[35] J. I. Satyro, *The smoothness of the solutions of certain degenerate second order equations*, Mat. Zametki, 10 (1971), pp. 101–111.

[36] M. Weber, *The fundamental solution of a degenerate partial differential equation of parabolic type*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 71 (1951), pp. 24–37.